arXiv:1601.08019v1 [math.DS] 29 Jan 2016

GENERIC POINTS OF SHIFT-INVARIANT MEASURES IN THE COUNTABLE SYMBOLIC SPACE

AIHUA FAN, MINGTIAN LI, AND JIHUA MA

Abstract. We are concerned with sets of generic points for shift-invariant measures in the countable symbolic space. We measure the sizes of the sets by the Billingsley-Hausdorff dimensions defined by Gibbs measures. It is shown that the dimension of such a set is given by a variational principle involving the convergence exponent of the Gibbs measure and the relative entropy dimension of the Gibbs measure with respect to the invariant measure. This variational principle is different from that of the case of finite symbols, where the convergent exponent is zero and is not involved. An application is given to a class of expanding interval dynamical systems.

1. Introduction

Consider the countable symbolic space $X = \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ endowed with the product topology and the shift mapping T on X defined by

$$T(x_1x_2x_3\cdots) = (x_2x_3x_4\cdots).$$

For any T-invariant Borel probability measure μ (we write $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$), define the set of μ-generic points by

$$G_\mu := \Big\{x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} S_n f(x) = \int_X f \,\mathrm{d}\mu \quad \text{for all } f \in C_b(X)\Big\},$$

where $S_n f(x) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^i x)$ is the n-th ergodic sum of f and $C_b(X)$ denotes the space of all bounded real-valued continuous functions on X.

Our aim in this paper is to investigate the size of G_μ by studying its Hausdorff dimension with respect to different metrics. Let ν be another probability measure supported on the whole space X. It induces a metric ρ_ν on $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ as follows: if $x = y$, define $\rho_\nu(x,y) = 0$; otherwise

$$\rho_\nu(x,y) = \nu([x_1\cdots x_n]),$$

where $n = \inf\{k \geq 0 : x_{k+1} \neq y_{k+1}\}$ and $[x_1\cdots x_n]$ (called cylinder) is the set of all sequences having $x_1\cdots x_n$ as prefix. The Hausdorff dimension of a subset of X with respect to the metric ρ_ν is the Billingsley dimension defined by ν ([2]).

In this paper, we only consider metrics defined by Gibbs measures (see the definition of Gibbs measure in Section 2. See also [25]). Let $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be

a function, called a potential. For any $n \geqslant 1$, we define its n-order variation by

$$\mathrm{var}_n\varphi := \sup\{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| : x_i = y_i, \text{ for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}.$$

We say that φ has summable variations if

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \mathrm{var}_n\varphi < \infty.$$

The Gurevich pressure of a potential φ with summable variations is defined to be the limit

$$P_\varphi := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \sum_{T^n x = x} e^{S_n\varphi(x)} 1_{[a]}(x),$$

where $a \in \mathbb{N}$ ([23]). It is shown that the limit exists and is independent of a. It is known ([24]) that a potential function φ with summable variations admits a unique Gibbs measure ν iff $\mathrm{var}_1\varphi < \infty$ and the Gurevich pressure $P_\varphi < \infty$.

As we shall prove, the Billingsley dimension $\dim_\nu G_\mu$ is tightly related to the convergence exponent of ν, which is defined by

$$\alpha_\nu := \inf\Big\{t > 0 : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \nu([n])^t < +\infty\Big\}.$$

It is evident that $\alpha_\nu \leqslant 1$. We will prove that if the measure theoretic entropy h_ν is the infinity we have $\alpha_\nu = 1$ (see Section 2.2). For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$, define the (relative) entropy dimension of ν with respect to μ by

$$\beta(\nu|\mu) := \limsup_{k\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_N^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \mu([\omega])}{\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_N^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega])}$$

where $\Sigma_N^k = \{1, \cdots, N\}^k$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ be an invariant Borel probability measure and φ be a potential function of summable variations admitting a unique Gibbs measure ν with convergence exponent α_ν. We have*

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu = \max\{\alpha_\nu, \beta(\nu|\mu)\}. \tag{1}$$

Let us apply (1) to two examples. First, when $\mu = \nu$, we have $\beta(\nu|\nu) = 1$. Then $\dim_\nu G_\nu = 1$. This can be obtained by the Birkhoff ergodic theorem, because ν is ergodic and of dimension 1. Second, consider the invariant measure δ_x where $x = 1^\infty$. It is easily seen that $\beta(\nu|\delta_x) = 0$. Thus $\dim_\nu G_{\delta_x} = \alpha_\nu$. This is not trivial. It reflects the difference between the case of finite symbols and that of countable symbols.

A potential function φ admitting a Gibbs measure is upper bounded, so that the integral $\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\mu$ is well defined as a number in the interval $[-\infty, +\infty)$. For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$, define the relative entropy of ν with respect to μ by

$$h(\nu|\mu) := \limsup_{k\to\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega]).$$

As we shall see (see Proposition 8),

$$h(\nu|\mu) = P_\varphi - \int_X \varphi \, \mathrm{d}\mu.$$

The dimension formula (1) can be expressed by entropies. Suppose $\mu \neq \nu$. If $h(\nu|\mu)$ is finite, then $\beta(\nu|\mu) = \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}$ (see Proposition 11). Thus we have

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu = \max\left\{\alpha_\nu, \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}\right\}.$$

If $h(\nu|\mu)$ is the infinity, we have $\alpha_\nu \geqslant \beta(\nu|\mu)$ (see Proposition 11). It follows that

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu = \alpha_\nu.$$

Let us present the idea of the proof. In the case of $\mu = \nu$, we have $\dim_\nu G_\nu = 1$ because the Gibbs measure ν is ergodic and of dimension 1. In the case of $\mu \neq \nu$, we first prove that for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ there exists a sequence of ergodic Markov measures $\{\mu_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ which converge in w^*-topology to μ, and h_{μ_j} tends to h_μ whenever h_μ is finite. Second, we show that α_ν is a universal lower bound by constructing a Cantor subset of G_μ. For the other part of lower bound we distinguish two cases: in the case of $h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty$, we construct a subset of G_μ by using the sequence of ergodic Markov measures $\{\mu_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ and show $\dim_\nu G_\mu \geqslant \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}$; in the case of $h(\nu|\mu) = +\infty$, we show $\alpha_\nu \geqslant \beta(\nu|\mu)$. For the upper bound, we adapt a standard argument by using an estimation on the entropy of subword distribution which has combinatoric feather (see [12]).

In 1973, Bowen considered the set of generic points G_μ in the setting of topological dynamical system $T : X \to X$ over compact metric space X. Bowen ([3]) proved that for any T-invariant Borel probability measure μ the topological entropy of the set of generic points G_μ is bounded by the measure theoretic entropy h_μ. Fan, Liao and Peyrière ([10]) showed that an equality holds if T satisfies the specification condition. In the case of finite symbolic space, a study of the Billingsley dimension of G_μ with respect to a shift-invariant Markov measure ν was performed by Cajar ([4]). He proved that $\dim_\nu G_\mu$ is equal to the entropy dimension of ν with respect to μ. Olivier ([17]) extended this result to Billingsley dimension with respect to a shift-invariant g-measure. Furthermore, Ma and Wen ([15]) even showed that the Hausdorff and Packing measure of G_μ satisfy a zero-infinity law. On the other hand, Gurevich and Tempelman ([13]) consider G_μ on high-dimensional finite symbolic systems. They evaluated the Hausdorff dimension of G_μ with respect to a wide class of metrics including Billlingsley metrics generated by Gibbs measures. Actually, there have been many works done on the generic points set ([4, 6, 13, 19, 20], see also the references therein). In the case of infinite symbolic space, the situation changes. Liao, Ma and Wang ([14]) considered the set of continued fractions with

maximal frequency oscillation. They proved that the set possessed Hausdorff dimension $\frac{1}{2}$. This constant $\frac{1}{2}$ was first observed there. Fan, Liao and Ma ([8]) considered sets of real numbers in $[0,1)$ with prescribed frequencies of partial quotients in their regular continued fraction expansions. They showed that $\frac{1}{2}$ is a universal lower bound of the Hausdorff dimensions of these frequency sets. Furthermore, Fan, Liao, Ma and Wang ([9]) considered the Hausdorff dimension of Besicovitch-Eggleston subsets in countable symbolic space. They found that the dimensions possess a universal lower bound depending only on the underlying metric.

Later, Fan, Jordan, Liao and Rams ([11]) considered expanding interval maps with infinitely many branches. They obtained multifractal decompositions based on Birkhoff averages for a class of continuous functions with respect to the Eulidean metric.

Theorem 1 will be applied to study the generic points of invariant measures in the Gauss dynamics which is related to the continued fractions. Actually, our result can be applied to a class of expanding interval mapping system. Recall that the Gauss transformation $S:[0,1)\to[0,1)$ is defined by

$$S(0):=0,\ S(x):=\frac{1}{x}-\left\lfloor\frac{1}{x}\right\rfloor,\ \forall x\in(0,1).$$

Let ℓ be an S-invariant Borel probability measure on $[0,1)$ and let $\mathcal{G}_\ell$ be the set of ℓ-generic points. Consider the potential function

$$\phi_s(x)=-s\ln|S'(x)|=2s\ln x$$

for $s>\frac{1}{2}$. The Gauss system is naturally coded by $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$. It is known that ϕ_s has summable variations and admits a unique Gibbs measure η_s whose convergence exponent is denoted by α_s. By a standard technique of transferring dimension results from the symbolic space to the interval $[0,1)$, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 2. *Let $\ell\in\mathcal{M}([0,1),S)$ be an S-invariant Borel probability measure and $s>\frac{1}{2}$. If $-\int_0^1\ln x\,\mathrm{d}\ell(x)<\infty$, then*

$$\dim_{\eta_s}\mathcal{G}_\ell=\max\left\{\alpha_s,\frac{h_\ell}{P_{\phi_s}-2s\int_0^1\ln x\,\mathrm{d}\ell(x)}\right\};$$

otherwise, we have

$$\dim_{\eta_s}\mathcal{G}_\ell=\alpha_s;$$

Remark that the Gurevich pressure P_{ϕ_s} equals the infinity if $s\leqslant\frac{1}{2}$ and the case $s=1$ of Theorem 2 corresponds to Theorem 1.2 in [11].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some preliminaries. Section 3 is devoted to the construction of a μ-generic point $x=(x_n)_{n\geqslant1}\in G_\mu$ satisfying $x_n\leqslant a_n$, where $\{a_n\}_{n\geqslant1}$ is a sequence of positive integers tending to the infinity. Using this point as seed we construct a Cantor subset of G_μ and we obtain the lower bound for $\dim_\nu G_\mu$ in Section

4. Section 5 is concerned with the upper bound for $\dim_\nu G_\mu$. In Section 6, Theorem 1 is applied to a class of expanding interval dynamics including the Gauss dynamics and Theorem 2 is proved there.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we will make some preparations: introducing a metric to describe the w^*-convergence in $\mathcal{M}(X)$, discussing Gibbs measures and defining the convergence exponent of a given measure, approximating a T-invariant measure by ergodic Markov measures and discussing the relative entropy of Gibbs measure with respect to a given T-invariant measure, approximating the above mentioned Markov measure by orbit measures.

First of all, let us begin with some notation. We denote by X the countable symbolic space $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ endowed with the product topology and define the *shift map* $T : X \to X$ by

$$(Tx)_n = x_{n+1}.$$

An element $(x_1 \cdots x_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ is called an n-length *word*. Let $\mathcal{A}^* = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{N}^n$ stand for the set of all finite words, where $\mathbb{N}^0$ denotes the set of empty word. Given $x = (x_1 x_2 \cdots) \in X$ and $m \geqslant n \geqslant 1$,

$$x|_n^m = (x_n \cdots x_m)$$

denotes a subword of x. For $\omega = (\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, the *$n$-cylinder* $[\omega]$ is defined by

$$[\omega] = \{x \in X : x|_1^n = \omega\}.$$

We will denote by $\mathcal{C}^n$ the set of all n-cylinders for $n \geqslant 0$. There is a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathbb{N}^n$ and $\mathcal{C}^n$. Let $\mathcal{C}^* = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}^n$ denote the set of all cylinders. For $j, N \geqslant 1$ we will write

$$\Sigma_N^j = \{1, \cdots, N\}^j, \qquad \mathcal{C}_N^j = \{[\omega] : \omega \in \Sigma_N^j\}.$$

2.1. **Metrization of the w^*-topology.** Recall that $\mathcal{M}(X)$ denotes the set of Borel probability measures on X. We endow $\mathcal{M}(X)$ with the w^*-topology induced by $C_b(X)$. Let us introduce a metric to describe the w^*-topology of $\mathcal{M}(X)$.

For every cylinder $[\omega] \in \mathcal{C}^*$, we choose a positive number $a_{[\omega]}$ so that

$$\sum_{[\omega] \in \mathcal{C}^*} a_{[\omega]} = 1,$$

where the sum is taken over all cylinders. For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, define

$$d^*(\mu, \nu) = \sum_{[\omega] \in \mathcal{C}^*} a_{[\omega]} |\mu([\omega]) - \nu([\omega])|.$$

The following proposition shows that the metric d^* is compatible with the w^*-topology of $\mathcal{M}(X)$.

Proposition 3. *Let $\{\mu_n\}_{n \geqslant 1} \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then μ_n converges in w^*-topology to μ if and only if $\lim_{n \to \infty} d^*(\mu_n, \mu) = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose μ_n converges in w^*-topology to μ, so that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu_n([\omega]) = \mu([\omega])$ for any $\omega \in \mathcal{A}^*$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Since $(a_{[\omega]})_{[\omega]\in\mathcal{C}^*}$ is a probability on the set of all cylinders, there exists a large integer $K \geqslant 1$ such that

$$\sum_{[\omega]\notin\mathcal{D}_K} a_{[\omega]} \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{4}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_K = \{[\omega] \in \mathcal{C}_K^m : 1 \leqslant m \leqslant K\}$. Since $\mathcal{D}_K$ is a finite set, we can find a positive integer $N \geqslant 1$ such that for any $n \geqslant N$ we have

$$\sum_{[\omega]\in\mathcal{D}_K} |\mu_n([\omega]) - \mu([\omega])| \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \tag{3}$$

Then, by (2), (3) and the fact that $\mu_n([\omega]) \leqslant 1$, we have

$$d^*(\mu_n,\mu) = \Big(\sum_{[\omega]\notin\mathcal{D}_K} + \sum_{[\omega]\in\mathcal{D}_K}\Big)\, a_{[\omega]}|\mu_n([\omega]) - \mu([\omega])| \leqslant \epsilon$$

for $n \geqslant N$. Thus we have proved $\lim_{n\to\infty} d^*(\mu_n,\mu) = 0$.

Conversely, suppose $\lim_{n\to\infty} d^*(\mu_n,\mu) = 0$. This implies immediately that for any $[\omega] \in \mathcal{C}^*$, $\mu_n([\omega]) \longrightarrow \mu([\omega])$ as $n \to \infty$. We finish the proof by using the following lemma which can be found in ([2], p.17).

Lemma 4. *Let Y be a metric space and $\mathcal{A}$ be a family of subsets of Y. Then μ_n converges in w^*-topology to μ if the following conditions are satisfied:*

(1) *$\mathcal{A}$ is closed under the finite intersection,*
(ii) *any open set U can be written as $U = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$ with $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$,*
(iii) *for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu_n(A) = \mu(A)$.*

The set of cylinders has the above properties of $\mathcal{A}$. □

For any $x \in X$ and $n \geqslant 1$, define the orbit measure

$$\Delta_{x,n} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{T^i x}.$$

By Proposition 3, we can rewrite G_μ as

$$G_\mu = \{x \in X : \Delta_{x,n} \xrightarrow{d^*} \mu \text{ as } n \to \infty\}.$$

The metric d^* can be extended to finite symbolic measure space over X and has the sub-linearity described in the following proposition which will be useful in the sequel.

Proposition 5. *For any $\mu_1, \mu_2, \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$d^*(\alpha\mu_1 + \beta\mu_2, \alpha\nu_1 + \beta\nu_2) \leqslant |\alpha| d^*(\mu_1,\nu_1) + |\beta| d^*(\mu_2,\nu_2).$$

Proof. It follows immediately from the definition of the metric d^*. □

The following proposition shows that two orbit measures approach each other, even uniformly, when the two orbit approach each other (under the Bowen metric).

Proposition 6. *The following equality holds:*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x|_1^n = y|_1^n} d^*(\Delta_{x,n}, \Delta_{y,n}) = 0. \tag{4}$$

Proof. First, observe that

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n = 1, \quad \text{where } A_n := \sum_{[\omega]\in\mathcal{C}^n} a_{[\omega]}.$$

By the sub-additivity of d^* stated in Proposition 5, we have

$$d^*(\Delta_{x,n}, \Delta_{y,n}) \leqslant \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d^*(\delta_{T^i x}, \delta_{T^i y}).$$

For any integer N such that $n > N \geqslant 1$, we break the above sum into two parts: $\sum_{i=0}^{n-N-1} + \sum_{i=n-N}^{n-1}$. Assume that $x|_1^n = y|_1^n$. By the definition of the metric d^*, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-N-1} d^*(\delta_{T^i x}, \delta_{T^i y}) \leqslant \sum_{i=0}^{n-N-1} \sum_{j=n-i+1}^{\infty} A_j \leqslant (n-N) \sum_{j=N+2}^{\infty} A_j.$$

Then by noting the trivial fact that $d^*(\delta_{T^i x}, \delta_{T^i y}) \leqslant 1$, we have

$$d^*(\Delta_{x,n}, \Delta_{y,n}) \leqslant \frac{n-N}{n} \sum_{j=N+2}^{\infty} A_j + \frac{N}{n}.$$

Letting n then N tend to the infinity, we finish the proof. □

2.2. **Gibbs measure.** We use Gibbs measures to induce metrics on X. The following facts about Gibbs measures can be found in [25].

Recall that for a function $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$, called *potential function*, the *n-order variation* of φ is defined by

$$\mathrm{var}_n\varphi := \sup\{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| : x, y \in X,\ x|_1^n = y|_1^n\}.$$

We say that a potential φ has *summable variations* if

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \mathrm{var}_n\varphi < +\infty.$$

It is easy to see that a potential φ with summable variations is uniformly continuous on X. The *Gurevich pressure* of φ with summable variations is defined to be the limit

$$P_\varphi := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \sum_{T^n x = x} e^{S_n\varphi(x)} 1_{[a]}(x),$$

where $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and it can be shown that the limit exists and is independent of a (see [23]).

An invariant probability measure ν is called a **Gibbs measure** associated to a potential function φ if it satisfies the Gibbsian property: there exist constants $C > 1$ and $P \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C} \leqslant \frac{\nu([x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n])}{\exp(S_n\varphi(x) - nP)} \leqslant C \tag{5}$$

holds for any $n \geqslant 1$ and any $x \in X$. It is known ([24]) that a potential function φ with summable variations admits a unique Gibbs measure ν iff $\mathrm{var}_1\varphi < +\infty$ and the Gurevich pressure $P_\varphi < +\infty$. Assume that φ admits a unique Gibbs measure ν_φ. Then the constant P in (5) is equal to the Gurevich pressure P_φ. Let $\varphi^* = \varphi - P_\varphi$, we have

$$P_{\varphi^*} = 0 \text{ and } \nu_{\varphi^*} = \nu_\varphi.$$

Hence, without loss of generality, we always suppose $P_\varphi = 0$ in the rest of this paper. A trivial fact is that the Gibbsian property (5) implies:

$$\forall x \in X, \quad \varphi(x) \leqslant \ln C. \tag{6}$$

It follows that the integral $\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\mu$ is defined as a number in $[-\infty, +\infty)$ for any probability measure μ. Also, the Gibbsian property implies the quasi Bernoulli property which will be exploited many times in the present paper.

Lemma 7. *Let ν be a Gibbs measure associated to potential φ. For any k words $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_k$, we have*

$$C^{-(k+1)}\nu([\omega_1 \cdots \omega_k]) \leqslant \nu([\omega_1]) \cdots \nu([\omega_k]) \leqslant C^{k+1}\nu([\omega_1 \cdots \omega_k]).$$

For any T-invariant Borel probability measure μ, define the *relative entropy* of ν with respect to μ by

$$h(\nu|\mu) = \limsup_{k\to\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega]).$$

It is trivially true that $h(\mu|\mu) = h_\mu$.

When ν is the Gibbs measure associated to φ, the relative entropy $h(\nu|\mu)$ is equal to the integral $-\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\mu$.

Proposition 8. *Assume that φ has summable variations and admits a unique Gibbs measure ν. Then for any invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$, we have*

$$h(\nu|\mu) = \lim_{k\to\infty} -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega]) = -\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\mu.$$

Proof. For each cylinder $[\omega]$, we arbitrarily choose a point x'_ω in $[\omega]$. Then for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, let

$$I_k(\lambda) = \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \lambda([\omega])\varphi(x'_\omega).$$

In virtue of (6), the above infinite series is defined as a number in $[-\infty, +\infty)$. Furthermore, the convergence of the series implies the absolute convergence. Since φ is uniformly continuous on X, for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ we have

$$\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\lambda = \lim_{k\to\infty} I_k(\lambda) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} I_i(\lambda). \tag{7}$$

First, we assume that $\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\mu > -\infty$. For $k \geqslant 1$, by the Gibbsian property of ν, we have

$$\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega]) \leqslant \ln C + \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) S_k\varphi(x_\omega).$$

Notice that

$$S_k\varphi(x_\omega) \leq [\varphi(x'_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_k}) + \mathrm{var}_k\varphi] + \cdots + [\varphi(x'_{\omega_k}) + \mathrm{var}_1\varphi].$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) S_k\varphi(x_\omega) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathrm{var}_j\varphi + [\sum_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_k\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_k])\varphi(x'_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_k}) \\
&+ \cdots + \sum_{\omega_k\in\mathbb{N}} \mu([\omega_k])\varphi(x'_{\omega_k})] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathrm{var}_j\varphi + \sum_{i=1}^{k} I_i(\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally we get

$$\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega]) \leq \ln C + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{var}_j\varphi + \sum_{i=1}^{k} I_i(\mu).$$

In the same way, we can also get the opposite inequality

$$\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega]) \geqslant -\ln C - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{var}_j\varphi + \sum_{i=1}^{k} I_i(\mu).$$

Thus

$$\left| \frac{1}{k}\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega]) - \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} I_i(\mu) \right| \leqslant \frac{\ln C + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{var}_j\varphi}{k}.$$

By (7) we obtain

$$h(\nu|\mu) = -\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\mu.$$

Now assume that $\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\mu = -\infty$. The similar argument works in combination with the following fact: there exists a sequence of points $\{x'_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_k}\}$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \mu([\omega])\varphi(x'_\omega) = -\infty.$$

□

By the concavity of the logarithm function ln, it is easy to show

$$h(\nu|\mu) \geqslant h_\mu. \tag{8}$$

By Proposition 8, we can rewrite the variational principle ([25], p. 86) in the following form

$$P_\varphi = \sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}(X,T)} \{h_\mu - h(\nu|\mu) : h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty\}. \tag{9}$$

Recall that we assume that $P_\varphi = 0$. It is known that the supremum in the variational principle (9) is attained only by a Gibbs measure ν with $h_\nu < \infty$ if such Gibbs measure exits ([25], p. 89). It follows that when $\nu \neq \mu$, we have $h(\nu|\mu) > h_\mu$, which implies $h(\nu|\mu) > 0$.

Recall that a Gibbs measure ν induces a metric ρ_ν on X: for any $x, y \in X$, if $x = y$, we define $\rho_\nu(x, y) = 0$; otherwise

$$\rho_\nu(x, y) = \nu([x|_1^n]),$$

where $n = \min\{k \geqslant 0 : x_{k+1} \neq y_{k+1}\}$. One can show that ρ_ν is a ultrametric and induces the product topology on X since ν is non-atomic and has X as its support. Let $n \geqslant 1$ be an integer. Define

$$\delta_n = \sup\{\nu([u]) : u \in \mathbb{N}^n\}.$$

The following proposition means that the ρ_ν-distance of two points uniformly tends to zero when they approach each other in the sense of Bowen. This property will be used in the proof for the upper bound of $\dim_\nu G_\mu$.

Proposition 9. *For $\{\delta_n\}_{n\geqslant 1}$ defined on the above, one has*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \delta_n = 0.$$

Proof. Suppose that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \delta_n = a > 0$. Note that δ_n is non-increasing. Then there exists a sequence of cylinders $[u_n] \in \mathcal{C}^n$ so that

$$\nu([u_n]) > a/2.$$

Observe that two cylinders either are disjoint or one is contained in the other. Since ν is a probability measure, there exists a cylinder $[u_{n_1}]$ which intersects infinitely many cylinders $\{[u_{n_k}] : k \geqslant 1\} \subset \{[u_n] : n \geqslant 1\}$. Actually, the cylinder $[u_{n_1}]$ contains every element of $\{[u_{n_k}] : k \geqslant 1\}$. By the same argument one can choose a cylinder $[u_{n_2}]$ with $n_2 > n_1$ which contains infinite elements of $\{[u_{n_k}] : k \geqslant 1\}$. In this way, one choose a sequence of decreasing cylinders $\{[u_{n_j}]\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ so that

$$\forall j \geqslant 1,\ \nu([u_{n_j}]) > a/2.$$

This contradicts the fact that the Gibbs measure ν has no atom. □

Remark that Proposition 9 also holds for any non-atom finite measure η supported on X.

Now we introduce several exponents which will be related to the Hausdorff dimension of G_μ. Define the *convergence exponent* of ν by

$$\alpha_\nu := \inf\Big\{t > 0 : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \nu([n])^t < +\infty\Big\}.$$

For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$, define the *entropy dimension* of ν with respect to μ by

$$\beta(\nu|\mu) := \limsup_{k\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{H_{k,N}(\mu,\mu)}{H_{k,N}(\nu,\mu)},$$

where

$$H_{k,N}(\nu,\mu) := -\sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_N^k} \mu([\omega]) \ln \nu([\omega]).$$

We are going to show that if $h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty$, then $\beta(\nu|\mu) = \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}$; if $h(\nu|\mu) = +\infty$, then $\beta(\nu|\mu) \leqslant \alpha_\nu$. But first, we remark that the convergence exponent α_ν has the following property.

Lemma 10. *Let α_ν be the convergence exponent of Gibbs measure ν associated to a potential function φ. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist constants C_0 and M such that*

$$\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \nu([\omega])^{\alpha_\nu+\epsilon} \leqslant C_0 M^k, \ (\forall k \geqslant 1). \tag{10}$$

Proof. Let $\gamma = \alpha_\nu + \epsilon$. By the definition of convergence exponent of ν, we have

$$M_0 := \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}} \nu([\omega])^\gamma < +\infty.$$

By the quasi Bernoulli property (Lemma 7), one gets

$$\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \nu([\omega])^\gamma \leqslant C^{\gamma(k+1)} \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \nu([\omega_1])^\gamma \cdots \nu([\omega_k])^\gamma = C^\gamma (C^\gamma M_0)^k.$$

Taking $C_0 = C^\gamma$ and $M = C^\gamma M_0$ completes the proof. □

If $\mu = \nu$, it is clear that $\beta(\nu|\mu) = 1$. However, we have the following claim.

Proposition 11. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ and φ be a potential function of summable variations. Assume that φ admits a unique Gibbs measure ν with convergence exponent α_ν. If $\nu \neq \mu$ and $h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty$, then*

$$\beta(\nu|\mu) = \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}; \tag{11}$$

if $h(\nu|\mu) = +\infty$, we have

$$\beta(\nu|\mu) \leqslant \alpha_\nu. \tag{12}$$

Proof. Assume that $\nu \neq \mu$. According to the analysis following (9), we have $h(\nu|\mu) > 0$.

If $0 < h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty$, it follows that $h_\mu < +\infty$. By Proposition 8, we have $\beta(\nu|\mu) = \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}$.

If $h(\nu|\mu) = +\infty$, then

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{k} H_{k,N}(\nu,\mu) = +\infty. \tag{13}$$

Assume that $\gamma > \alpha_\nu$. To prove the inequality (12) we shall use the following result (see [29], p. 217): let $t_1, \cdots, t_m$ be given real numbers. If $s_j > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^m s_j = 1$ then

$$\sum_{j=1}^m s_j(t_j - \ln s_j) \leqslant \ln(\sum_{j=1}^m e^{t_j}). \tag{14}$$

For any fixed integers N and k which are large enough, there is a bijection $\pi : \{1, \cdots, N^k\} \to \mathcal{C}_N^k$. Applying (14) to $m = N^k + 1, s_j = \mu(\pi(j))$, for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant N^k$ and $s_m = \sum_{[\omega]\notin\mathcal{C}_N^k} \mu([\omega])$ and $t_j = \gamma \ln \nu(\pi(j))$, for $1 \leqslant j \leqslant N^k$ and $t_m = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \gamma \sum_{j=1}^{N^k} \mu(\pi(j)) \ln \nu(\pi(j)) - \sum_{j=1}^{N^k} \mu(\pi(j)) \ln \mu(\pi(j)) \\ \leqslant \quad & s_m \ln s_m + \ln(1 + \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_N^k} \nu([\omega])^\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{H_{k,N}(\mu,\mu)}{H_{k,N}(\nu,\mu)} \leqslant \gamma + \frac{s_m \ln s_m}{H_{k,N}(\nu,\mu)} + \frac{\ln(1 + \sum_{\omega\in\Sigma_N^k} \nu([\omega])^\gamma)}{H_{k,N}(\nu,\mu)}.$$

By (10) and (13), we finish the proof by letting $N \to \infty$ and then $k \to \infty$. □

As a direct corollary, it follows that a Gibbs measure ν with $h_\nu = +\infty$ has convergence exponent $\alpha_\nu = 1$ because $\beta(\nu|\nu) = 1$.

2.3. **Approximation of invariant measure by Markov measures.** For any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$, we are going to construct a sequence of ergodic Markov measures $\{\mu_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ which approximate μ in w^*-topology. Actually, the entropy h_{μ_j} of μ_j also approaches the entropy h_μ of μ wherever $h_\mu < +\infty$.

Let $l \geqslant 1$ be an integer. An l-Markov measure with state $S = \mathbb{N}$ is a measure $\upsilon \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ having the Markov property:

$$\forall n > l \text{ and } \forall \omega_1 \cdots \omega_n \in \mathbb{N}^n, \quad \frac{\upsilon([\omega_1 \cdots \omega_n])}{\upsilon([\omega_1 \cdots \omega_{n-1}])} = \frac{\upsilon([\omega_{n-l} \cdots \omega_n])}{\upsilon([\omega_{n-l} \cdots \omega_{n-1}])}.$$

Given $\upsilon \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and $l \geqslant 2$, by a standard construction one can obtain an $(l-1)$-Markov measure υ_l which coincides with υ on all l-cylinders (see [7]).

In particular, a 1-Markov measure (we call Markov measure for simplicity) can be obtained by a stochastic matrix $\mathbf{P} = (p_{ij})_{S\times S}$ and a probability vector $\mathbf{p} = (p_i)_{i\in S}$. For any $x_1\cdots x_n \in S^n$

$$\upsilon([x_1\cdots x_n]) := p_{x_1}p_{x_1x_2}\cdots p_{x_{n-1}x_n}.$$

The measure υ is T-invariant iff $\mathbf{p}$ is invariant with respect to $\mathbf{P}$ (i.e. $\mathbf{pP} = \mathbf{p}$). Assume that $\mathbf{P}$ is a primitive matrix. Then $\mathbf{P}$ is positive recurrent iff there is an invariant probability vector $\mathbf{p}$ on S (see [27], p.177).

Since the partition consisting of all 1-cylinders is a generator, the entropy h_μ of any invariant measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ can be expressed as (see [29])

$$h_\mu = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{j}\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^j} -\mu([\omega])\ln\mu([\omega]).$$

Especially, if the entropy h_μ is finite we have (see [7])

$$h_\mu = \lim_{j\to\infty}\sum_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_j\in\mathbb{N}^j} -\mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_j])\ln\frac{\mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_j])}{\mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_{j-1}])}.$$

The following proposition states that there exists a sequence of ergodic Markov measures $\{\mu_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ approximating μ in w^*-topology.

Proposition 12. *For every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$, there exists a sequence of ergodic Markov measures $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ such that*

$$w^*\text{-}\lim_{j\to\infty}\mu_j = \mu.$$

Furthermore, if $h_\mu < +\infty$, we have

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} h_{\mu_j} = h_\mu.$$

Proof. First, we assume that μ is supported on the whole space X, otherwise we can place μ by $\mu_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)\mu + \epsilon\mu_0$, where $0<\epsilon<1$ and μ_0 is a fixed T-invariant Borel probability measure supported on whole space X. Fix $j \geqslant 3$ (the cases $j=1$ and $j=2$ will be treated separately), we consider the state space $S_j = \mathbb{N}^{j-1}$ and the probability vector $\mathbf{p}_j = (\mu([\omega]))_{\omega\in S_j}$. Take a stochastic matrix $\mathbf{P}_j = (p_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_{j-1},\theta_1\cdots\theta_{j-1}})_{S_j\times S_j}$, where

$$p_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_{j-1},\theta_1\cdots\theta_{j-1}} = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_{j-1}\theta_{j-1}])}{\mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_{j-1}])}, & \text{if } \omega_2\cdots\omega_{j-1} = \theta_1\cdots\theta_{j-2},\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Then, $\mathbf{P}_j$ and $\mathbf{p}_j$ determine a unique Markov measure υ_j by virtue of the Markov property. It is easy to check that $\mathbf{p}_j\mathbf{P}_j = \mathbf{p}_j$. This implies that υ_j is T_j-invariant, where T_j is the shift map on symbolic space $S_j^{\mathbb{N}}$. Furthermore, one can show that the matrix $\mathbf{P}_j$ is primitive because $\mathbf{P}_j^n > 0$ for any $n > j$, so $\mathbf{P}_j$ is positive recurrent. In fact, by a standard argument, we can even show that υ_j is strong-mixing with respect to T_j (see [29], p. 42). Let μ_j be the $(j-1)$-Markov measure which coincides with μ on all j-cylinders by

a standard construction. One can show that $(S_j^{\mathbb{N}}, T_j, \upsilon_j)$ is isomorphic to (X, T, μ_j). Hence μ_j is ergodic with respect to T. For the cases of $j = 1$ and $j = 2$, we consider state spaces $S_1 = S_2 = \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{p}_1 = \mathbf{p}_2 = (\mu([i]))_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$. Take $\mathbf{P}_1 = (p_{ij})_{\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}}$, where

$$p_{ij} = \mu([j]),\ \forall\ i, j \geqslant 1,$$

and $\mathbf{P}_2 = (p_{ij})_{\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}}$, where

$$p_{ij} = \frac{\mu([ij])}{\mu([i])},\ \forall\ i, j \geqslant 1.$$

By the same argument as in the case $j \geqslant 3$, one obtain two ergodic measures μ_1 (usually called Bernoulli measure) and μ_2 on X.

Now we prove that μ_j converge in w^*-topology to μ. By Proposition 3 it is sufficient to show $d^*(\mu, \mu_j) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. In fact,

$$d^*(\mu, \mu_j) \quad = \quad \sum_{[\omega]\in\mathcal{C}^*} a_{[\omega]}|\mu([\omega]) - \mu_j([u])| \leqslant \sum_{|\omega|\geqslant j+1} a_{[\omega]} \to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty.$$

At last, assume that $h_\mu < +\infty$. Recall that μ coincides μ_j with all j-cylinders. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_\mu &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \sum_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_j\in\mathbb{N}^j} -\mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_j]) \ln \frac{\mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_j])}{\mu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_{j-1}])} \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} \sum_{\omega_1\cdots\omega_j\in\mathbb{N}^j} -\mu_j([\omega_1\cdots\omega_j]) \ln \frac{\mu_j([\omega_1\cdots\omega_j])}{\mu_j([\omega_1\cdots\omega_{j-1}])} \\ &= \lim_{j\to\infty} h_{\mu_j}. \end{aligned}$$

□

In the sequel, the sequence $\{\mu_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ constructed in the proof of Proposition 12 will be called sequence of Markov approximation of μ. Now we present the approximation property of the relative entropy $h(\nu|\mu)$ by $h(\nu|\mu_j)$.

Proposition 13. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $\{\mu_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ be the sequence Markov approximation of μ. Assume that the potential φ with summable variations admits a unique Gibbs measure ν.*

(i) *If $h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty$, then $h(\nu|\mu_j) < +\infty$ for all $j \geqslant 1$ and*

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} h(\nu|\mu_j) = h(\nu|\mu).$$

(ii) *If $h(\nu|\mu) = +\infty$, then*

$$h(\nu|\mu_j) = +\infty,\ \forall j \geqslant 1.$$

Proof. Recall that for any $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(X)$, let

$$I_k(\lambda) = \sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^k} \lambda([\omega])\varphi(x'_\omega),$$

where x'_ω is an arbitrarily chosen point in $[\omega]$. By Proposition 8, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ we have

$$h(\nu|\mu) = -\int_X \varphi \,\mathrm{d}\mu = -\lim_{k\to\infty} I_k(\mu).$$

Suppose $h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty$. For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an integer $N_1 \geqslant 1$ such that

$$\forall k > N_1,\ |h(\nu|\mu) + I_k(\mu)| \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

On the other hand, by the definition of variation we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_k(\mu_j) &= \sum_{[\omega]\in\mathcal{C}^{k-1}} \sum_{\omega_k=1}^{\infty} \mu_j([\omega\omega_k])\varphi(x'_{\omega\omega_k}) \\ &\leqslant \sum_{[\omega]\in\mathcal{C}^{k-1}} \sum_{\omega_k=1}^{\infty} \mu_j([\omega\omega_k])(\varphi(x'_\omega) + \mathrm{var_{k-1}}\varphi) \\ &= I_{k-1}(\mu_j) + \mathrm{var}_{k-1}\varphi. \end{aligned}$$

A obvious induction on k gives

$$\forall k > j,\ I_k(\mu_j) \leqslant I_j(\mu_j) + \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \mathrm{var}_i\varphi. \tag{15}$$

In the same way, we can also get the opposite inequality

$$\forall k > j,\ I_k(\mu_j) \geqslant I_j(\mu_j) - \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \mathrm{var}_i\varphi.$$

Thus, noting a fact that $I_j(\mu_j) = I_j(\mu)$, we have

$$\forall k > j,\ |I_k(\mu_j) - I_j(\mu)| \leqslant \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} \mathrm{var}_i\varphi.$$

Since φ is of summable variations, there exists a positive integer N_2 depending on ϵ such that

$$\sum_{n>N_2} \mathrm{var}_n\varphi \leqslant \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Let $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$. For any $j \geqslant N$ and $k \geqslant j+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_k(\mu_j) + h(\nu|\mu)| &\leqslant |I_k(\mu_j) - I_j(\mu)| + |I_j(\mu) + h(\nu|\mu)| \\ &\leqslant \sum_{i=j}^{k} \mathrm{var}_i\varphi + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \leqslant \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $k \to +\infty$, we get

$$|h(\nu|\mu_j) - h(\nu|\mu)| \leqslant \epsilon.$$

Then we have proved $\lim_{j\to\infty} h(\nu|\mu_j) = h(\nu|\mu)$.

Suppose $h(\nu|\mu) = +\infty$. Fix an integer k and by a similar argument as above we have

$$\forall n > k,\ I_k(\mu) \leqslant I_n(\mu) + \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} \mathrm{var}_i\varphi.$$

When n tends to ∞, $I_n(\mu)$ tends to $-h(\nu|\mu)$. Then $I_k(\mu) = -\infty$.

For any $j \geqslant 1$, by (15) we have

$$h(\nu|\mu_j) = \lim_{k\to\infty} -I_k(\mu_j) \geqslant -I_j(\mu) - \sum_{i=j}^{+\infty} \mathrm{var}_i\varphi = +\infty.$$

Thus we complete the proof. □

At the end of this section, we derive further useful properties of $\{\mu_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ which will play an important role in the proof for lower bound of the Hausdorff dimension of G_μ. One of these properties is that most of orbit measures approach μ_j, as consequence of the ergodicity of μ_j.

Proposition 14. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ and $\{\mu_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ be the sequence of Markov approximation of μ. Then there exist a sequence of Borel subsets $\{M_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ and a sequence of increasing integers $\{m_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ such that*

$$\forall j \geqslant 1,\ \mu_j(M_j) \geqslant 1 - \frac{1}{4^j},$$

$$\forall x \in M_j, n \geqslant m_j,\ d^*(\mu_j, \Delta_{x,n}) \leqslant \frac{1}{4^j},$$

$$\forall n \geqslant m_j,\ \sup_{x|_1^n = y|_1^n} d^*(\Delta_{x,n}, \Delta_{y,n}) \leqslant \frac{1}{j}.$$

Furthermore, if φ has summable variations and admits a unique Gibbs measure satisfying $h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty$, then we can even find a sequence of increasing integers $\{b_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ such that for any $j \geqslant 1$

$$\forall x \in M_j, 1 \leqslant n \leqslant m_j,\ |S_n\varphi(x)| \leqslant b_j,$$

$$\forall x \in M_j, n \geqslant m_j,\ \left|\frac{1}{n} S_n\varphi(x) + h(\nu|\mu_j)\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{4^j},$$

$$\forall x \in M_j, n \geqslant m_j,\ \left|\frac{1}{n} \ln \mu_j([x|_1^n]) + h_{\mu_j}\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{4^j}.$$

Proof. This is a rather direct consequence of the Egoroff theorem, the convergence results proved above, the Birkhoff ergodic theorem and Shannon-McMillan-Breiman theorem.

First, by the ergodicity of μ_j, for every cylinder $[\omega]$ we have

$$\Delta_{n,x}([\omega]) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{T^i x}([\omega]) \to \mu_j([\omega]),\ \mu_j - a.e..$$

Hence by Lemma 4, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d^*(\mu_j, \Delta_{x,n}) = 0,\ \mu_j - a.e..$$

By the Egoroff theorem, the above convergence is uniform on some Borel subset $M_j^{(1)} \subset X$ with $\mu_j(M_j^{(1)}) \geqslant 1 - \frac{1}{4^{j+1}}$. Therefore there exists an increasing sequence of positive integers $\{m_j^{(1)}\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ such that

$$d^*(\mu_j, \Delta_{x,n}) \leqslant \frac{1}{4^j}, \forall x \in M_j^{(1)}, n \geqslant m_j^{(1)}.$$

Second, since $h(\nu|\mu) < +\infty$, by (8), Proposition 12 and 13 we have

$$h_\mu < +\infty,\ h_{\mu_j} < +\infty \text{ and } h(\nu|\mu_j) < +\infty,\ \forall j \geqslant 1.$$

In this way, by the Shannon-McMillan-Breiman theorem there exist a Borel subset $M_j^{(2)} \subset X$ and $m_j^{(2)} \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\mu_j(M_j^{(2)}) \geqslant 1 - \frac{1}{4^{j+1}}$$

and

$$\left|\frac{1}{n}\ln \mu_j([x|_1^n]) + h_{\mu_j}\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{4^j},\ \forall x \in M_j^{(2)}, n \geqslant m_j^{(2)}.$$

Third, by the Birkhoff ergodic theorem there exist a Borel subset $M_j^{(3)} \subset X$ and $m_j^{(3)} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mu_j(M_j^{(3)}) \geqslant 1 - \frac{1}{4^{j+1}}$$

and

$$\left|\frac{1}{n}S_n\varphi(x) + h(\nu|\mu_j)\right| \leqslant \frac{1}{4^j},\ \forall x \in M_j^{(3)}, n \geqslant m_j^{(3)}.$$

By Proposition 6, there exists positive integer $m_j^{(4)} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geqslant m_j^{(4)}$ and $x, y \in X$ satisfying $x|_1^n = y|_1^n$,

$$d^*(\Delta_{x,n}, \Delta_{y,n}) \leqslant \frac{1}{j}.$$

Take $m_j = \max_{1\leqslant i\leqslant 4}\{m_j^{(i)}\}$. By the invariance of μ_j, we have for any $n \geqslant 1$,

$$\left|\int_X S_n\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_j\right| < +\infty.$$

Thus there exist Borel subset $Q_j^{(n)} \subset X$ and positive integer $b_j^{(n)}$ so that

$$\mu_j(Q_j^{(n)}) \geqslant 1 - \frac{1}{2^n}\frac{1}{4^{j+1}},\ n \geqslant 1$$

and

$$|S_n\varphi(x)| \leqslant b_j^{(n)},\ \forall x \in Q_j^{(n)},\ n \geqslant 1.$$

Let $M_j^{(4)} := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} Q_j^{(n)}$ and $b_j := \sum_{n=1}^{m_j} b_j^{(n)}$. Thus we have

$$\mu_j(M_j^{(4)}) \geqslant 1 - \frac{1}{4^{j+1}},$$

and

$$|S_n\varphi(x)| \leqslant b_j,\ \forall x \in M_j^{(4)}, 1 \leqslant n \leqslant m_j.$$

Finally, take $M_j := \bigcap_{i=1}^4 M_j^{(i)}$ and we complete the proof. □

3. The construction of a seed of G_μ

Let $\{a_n\}_{n\geqslant 1}$ be a sequence of positive integers tending to the infinity. In this section, we construct a μ-generic point $z = (z_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ of G_μ such that $z_n \leqslant a_n$. By using such a point, called seed of G_μ, we will construct a Cantor subset of G_μ in next section. The techniques we use are inspired by [15].

Proposition 15. *For any sequence of positive integers $\{a_n\}_{n\geqslant 1}$ tending to the infinity, there exists a point $z = (z_n)_{n\geqslant 1} \in G_\mu$ such that $z_n \leqslant a_n$ for all $n \geqslant 1$.*

Proof. For simplicity, we first construct a μ-generic point $z = (z_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ satisfying $z_n \leqslant n$ for $n \geqslant 1$.

For $j \geqslant 1$, let μ_j, m_j and M_j be the same as in Proposition 14. Given a sequence of finite words $W_1, W_2, W_3, \cdots$, juxtaposing the elements of the sequence, we get an infinite word

$$z = W_1W_2W_3\cdots.$$

In what follows, we will define $\{W_j\}$ by induction on j. By the way, a sequence of integers $\{n_j\}_{j\geqslant 1}$ will also be defined by induction. When n_j is defined, let

$$H_j = \{z_1\cdots z_{n_j} \in \mathbb{N}^{n_j} : z = (z_1\cdots z_{n_j}\cdots) \in M_j\}.$$

Take $n_1 = m_2,\ n_2 = m_3,\ \widetilde{x}_1 = 1^{n_1}$ and $\widetilde{x}_2 \in H_2$. Denote the maximum of the digits in $\widetilde{x}_2$ by s_2. Then take a sufficiently large $t_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N_1 := t_1n_1 \geqslant s_2$ and then define

$$W_1 = \widetilde{x}_1^{t_1}.$$

Suppose $W_1, \cdots, W_j, N_1\cdots N_j$ are defined and $\widetilde{x}_1, \cdots, \widetilde{x}_{j+1}, n_1\cdots, n_{j+1}$ are also defined. We define W_{j+1}, N_{j+1} and $\widetilde{x}_{j+2}, n_{j+2}$ in the following way: take $n_{j+2} \geqslant m_{j+3}^2$ and $\widetilde{x}_{j+2} \in H_{j+2}$. Denote the maximal number of the digits in $\widetilde{x}_{j+2}$ by s_{j+2}. Then take a $t_{j+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$N_{j+1} := t_{j+1}n_{j+1} + N_j \geqslant \max\{N_j^2, s_{j+2}\}.$$

Then define

$$W_{j+1} = \widetilde{x}_{j+1}^{t_{j+1}}.$$

Let $z = (z_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ be the sequence $W_1W_2\cdots$. We show that $z_n \leqslant n$ for all $n \geqslant 1$. In fact, for $N_j < n \leqslant N_{j+1}$, by the definition of W_j we have

$$z_n \leqslant s_{j+1} \leqslant N_j < n.$$

Now, we show $z \in G_\mu$. Since the point z is obtained by juxtaposing the prefixes of points with orbit measures approximating the sequence of Markov approximation of μ, it is natural to approximate the orbit measure $\Delta_{z,n}$ by this sequence of Markov measures. Suppose $n \in [N_j, N_{j+1})$ for some j. Recall that

$$N_j = t_1 n_1 + t_2 n_2 + \cdots + t_j n_j.$$

Then there exists a unique integer t $(0 \leqslant t < t_{j+1})$ such that

$$N_j + t n_{j+1} \leqslant n < N_j + (t+1) n_{j+1}.$$

Thus by the definition of $\Delta_{z,n}$ we divide it into four parts

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{z,n} &= \frac{1}{n}\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{N_{j-1}-1} + \sum_{i=N_{j-1}}^{N_j-1} + \sum_{i=N_j}^{N_j+tn_{j+1}-1} + \sum_{i=N_j+tn_{j+1}}^{n-1}\Big)(\delta_{T^i z}) \\
&= \alpha_1 \Delta_{z,N_{j-1}} + \alpha_2 \Delta_{T^{N_{j-1}} z, t_j n_j} + \alpha_3 \Delta_{T^{N_j} z, t n_{j+1}} \\
&+ \alpha_4 \Delta_{T^{N_j + t n_{j+1}} z, n - N_j - t n_{j+1}},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha_1 := \frac{N_{j-1}}{n},\ \alpha_2 := \frac{t_j n_j}{n}, \alpha_3 := \frac{t n_{j+1}}{n},\ \alpha_4 := \frac{n - N_j - t n_{j+1}}{n}.$$

It is obvious that $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i = 1$. By Proposition 5, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& d^*\left(\alpha_1 \mu_{j-1} + \alpha_2 \mu_j + (\alpha_3 + \alpha_4)\mu_{j+1}, \Delta_{z,n}\right) \\
\leqslant\ & \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 d^*(\mu_j, \Delta_{T^{N_{j-1}} z, t_j n_j}) + \alpha_3 d^*(\mu_{j+1}, \Delta_{T^{N_j} z, t n_{j+1}}) \\
+\ & \alpha_4 d^*(\mu_{j+1}, \Delta_{T^{N_j + t n_{j+1}} z, n - N_j - t n_{j+1}}).
\end{aligned}$$

We will estimate the first three terms in the right-hand side of the above inequlaity in advance. By the definition of N_j, we have

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{N_{j-1}}{n} \leqslant \frac{N_{j-1}}{N_j} \leqslant \frac{1}{N_{j-1}}.$$

Recalling the construction of H_j, there exists $y \in M_j$ such that $y|_1^{n_j} = \widetilde{x}_j$. Note that $T^{N_{j-1}} z \in M_j$. By Proposition 14 we have

$$d^*(\mu_j, \Delta_{y,n_j}) \leqslant \frac{1}{4^j} \text{ and } d^*(\Delta_{y,n_j}, \Delta_{T^{N_{j-1}} z, n_j}) \leqslant \frac{1}{j}.$$

By the sub-affinity of the metric d^*, it is easy to show

$$d^*(\Delta_{y,n_j}, \Delta_{T^{N_{j-1}} z, t_j n_j}) \leqslant \frac{1}{j}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
d^*(\mu_j, \Delta_{T^{N_{j-1}} z, t_j n_j}) &\leqslant d^*(\mu_j, \Delta_{y,n_j}) + d^*(\Delta_{y,n_j}, \Delta_{T^{N_{j-1}} z, t_j n_j}) \\
&\leqslant \frac{1}{4^j} + \frac{1}{j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar arguments as above yield

$$d^*(\mu_{j+1}, \Delta_{T^{N_j}z, tn_{j+1}}) \leqslant \frac{1}{4^{j+1}} + \frac{1}{j+1}.$$

For the last term, we need to deal with two cases separately.

Case 1: $N_j + tn_{j+1} \leqslant n < N_j + tn_{j+1} + m_{j+1}$. In this case, we have

$$\alpha_4 = \frac{n - N_j - tn_{j+1}}{n} \leqslant \frac{m_{j+1}}{n} \leqslant \frac{m_{j+1}}{n_j} \leqslant \frac{1}{m_{j+1}}.$$

Case 2: $N_j + tn_{j+1} + m_{j+1} \leqslant n < N_j + (t+1)n_{j+1}$. In this case, similar arguments as on the above yield

$$d^*(\mu_{j+1}, \Delta_{T^{N_j+tn_{j+1}}z, n-N_j-tn_{j+1}}) \leqslant \frac{1}{4^{j+1}} + \frac{1}{j+1}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d^*\left(\alpha_1\mu_{j-1} + \alpha_2\mu_j + (\alpha_3+\alpha_4)\mu_{j+1}, \Delta_{z,n}\right) \\ \leqslant\ & \frac{1}{N_{j-1}} + (\frac{1}{4^j} + \frac{1}{j}) + (\frac{1}{4^{j+1}} + \frac{1}{j+1}) + (\frac{1}{m_{j+1}} + \frac{1}{4^{j+1}} + \frac{1}{j+1}) \\ \to\ & 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

This combined with $\lim_{j\to\infty} d^*(\mu, \alpha_1\mu_{j-1} + \alpha_2\mu_j + (\alpha_3+\alpha_4)\mu_{j+1}) = 0$, yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} d^*(\mu, \Delta_{z,n}) = 0,$$

which implies $z \in G_\mu$.

Noting that the integer t_j for defining N_j ($j \geqslant 1$) can be taken arbitrarily large, we can construct a μ-generic point $z = (z_n)_{n\geqslant 1}$ such that $z_n \leqslant a_n$ for all $n \geqslant 1$. □

4. The lower bound of the Hausdorff dimension of G_μ

In this section, we will prove the lower bound for the Hausdorff dimension of G_μ. It is well known that the Gibbs measure ν is ergodic ([25], p.99). If $\nu = \mu$, by Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem and Lemma 4 we have $\nu(G_\nu) = 1$. Then $\dim_\nu G_\nu = 1$. Since $\beta(\nu|\nu) = 1$, we have finished the proof of Theorem 1 in the case of $\nu = \mu$. In the sequel, we consider the case where $\mu \neq \nu$.

First, we prove that α_ν is a lower bound.

Proposition 16. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ be an invariant Borel probability measure. Assume that φ has summable variations and admits a unique Gibbs measure ν with convergence exponent α_ν. Then we have*

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu \geqslant \alpha_\nu.$$

To prove this lower bound, we will construct a Cantor subset of G_μ and apply Billingsley's theorem. Before so doing, we need the following lemma about the convergence exponent α_ν, which can be found in [9]. An ordering of cylinders is considered according to the sizes of ν-measures of the 1-cylinders.

Lemma 17. *Let α_ν be the convergence exponent of ν. Consider a bijection $\pi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $\nu([\pi(1)]) \geqslant \nu([\pi(2)]) \geqslant \cdots$. Then there exists an increasing sequence $\{s_k\}_{k\geqslant 1} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \ln s_k \gg n^3, \tag{16}$$

and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $0 < \delta < 1$, there exists an integer $N(\varepsilon, \delta)$ such that for $k \geqslant N$ we have

$$s_k - s_k^\delta > s_k^{1-\varepsilon}, \tag{17}$$

and for $\pi^{-1}(\omega) \in (s_k - s_k^\delta, s_k]$, we have

$$(1-\varepsilon)\ln \pi^{-1}(\omega) < -\alpha_\nu \ln \nu([\omega]) < \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \ln \pi^{-1}(\omega). \tag{18}$$

Proof. Since the convergence exponent of ν is invariant under the bijection π, we have (see [22], p. 26)

$$\alpha_\nu = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln n}{-\ln \nu([\pi(n)])}. \tag{19}$$

Therefore, one may choose an increasing sequence $\{s_k\}_{k\geqslant 1}$ satisfying (16) such that the limit in (19) along with s_k exists. So, for any $0 < \varepsilon, \delta < 1$, there exists an integer $N_1 = N_1(\varepsilon, \delta)$ such that for all $k \geqslant N_1$, (17) is satisfied and

$$(1-\varepsilon)\ln s_k < -\alpha_\nu \ln \nu([\pi(s_k)]) < (1+\varepsilon)\ln s_k. \tag{20}$$

On the other hand, by (19), there exists an integer N_2 such that for all $n \geqslant N_2$

$$-\alpha_\nu \ln \nu([\pi(n)]) > (1-\varepsilon)\ln n. \tag{21}$$

Thus if we take $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ then by(17), (20) and (21), for all $n \in (s_k - s_k^\delta, s_k](k \geqslant N)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(1-\varepsilon)\ln n &< -\alpha_\nu \ln \nu([\pi(n)]) \\ &\leqslant -\alpha_\nu \ln \nu([\pi(s_k)]) \\ &< (1+\varepsilon)\ln s_k < \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\ln(s_k - s_k^\delta) < \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\ln n.\end{aligned}$$

In other words, for $\pi^{-1}(\omega) \in (s_k - s_k^\delta, s_k](k \geqslant N)$, we have (18). □

For any $0 < \varepsilon, \delta < 1$, let N and $\{s_k\}_{k\geqslant 1}$ be the same as in Lemma 17. By Proposition 15 and (16), we can choose a seed $z = (z_n)_{n\geqslant 1} \in G_\mu$ such that

$$-\sum_{k=1}^{(n+1)^2} \ln \nu([z_k]) \ll \sum_{k=1}^{n} \ln s_k. \tag{22}$$

We use this seed to generate a Cantor subset in G_μ large enough. Roughly speaking, we replace the word z_{k^2} by any word in $\pi((s_k - s_k^\delta, s_k])$. More precisely, define

$$F_z(\varepsilon,\delta)=\left\{x\in X: x_n\begin{cases}\in \pi((s_k-s_k^\delta,s_k]), \text{ if } n=k^2 \text{ and } k>N,\\ =z_n, \text{ otherwise.}\end{cases}\right\}$$

Since our modification of z is made on square integer coordinates which are of zero density, it is easy to check $F_z(\varepsilon,\delta)\subset G_\mu$. The following proposition immediately implies that $\dim_\nu G_\mu \geqslant \alpha_\nu$.

Proposition 18. *For any $0<\varepsilon<1$ and $0<\delta<1$, we have*

$$\dim_\nu F_z(\varepsilon,\delta)\geqslant \frac{\alpha_\nu(1-\varepsilon)\delta}{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. In order to apply Billingsley's theorem, we are going to construct a measure λ supported by $F_z(\varepsilon,\delta)$ such that for any $x\in F_z(\varepsilon,\delta)$,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\ln\lambda([x|_1^n])}{\ln\nu([x|_1^n])}\geqslant\frac{\alpha_\nu(1-\varepsilon)\delta}{1+\varepsilon}.$$

For $x\in F_z(\varepsilon,\delta)$ and for $k^2\leq n<(k+1)^2 (k\geq N)$ define

$$\lambda([x|_1^n])=\prod_{r=N}^{k}\frac{1}{s_r^\delta}.$$

The measure λ is well defined on $F_z(\varepsilon,\delta)$.

For any $x\in F_z(\varepsilon,\delta)$, by the quasi Bernoulli property of ν we have

$$\nu([x|_1^n])\geqslant\frac{1}{C^{n+1}}\prod_{k=1}^{n}\nu([x_k])=\frac{1}{C^{n+1}}\prod_{m=1}^{*n}\nu([z_m])\prod_{r=N}^{k}\nu([x_{r^2}])$$

where $*$ signifies the absence of the square numbers in $[N,n]$ in the product. In combination with the definition of λ, this yields

$$\frac{\ln\lambda([x|_1^n])}{\ln\nu([x|_1^n])}\geqslant\frac{\delta\sum_{r=N}^{k}\ln s_r}{(n+1)\ln C-\sum_{m=1}^{n}\ln\nu([z_m])-\sum_{r=N}^{k}\ln\nu([x_{r^2}])}.$$

Since for $x\in F_z(\epsilon,\delta)$, $x_{r^2}\in\pi((s_r-s_r^\delta,s_r])$, we get

$$\pi^{-1}(x_{r^2})\in(s_r-s_r^\delta,s_r].$$

Thus by (18), we have

$$-\ln\nu([x_{r^2}])<\frac{1}{\alpha_\nu}\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\ln s_r.$$

Therefore, by the above inequality we have

$$\frac{\ln\lambda([x|_1^n])}{\ln\nu([x|_1^n])} > \frac{\delta\sum_{r=N}^{k}\ln s_r}{(n+1)\ln C - \sum_{m=1}^{(k+1)^2}\ln\nu([z_m]) + \frac{1}{\alpha_\nu}\frac{1+\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\sum_{r=N}^{k}\ln s_r}.$$

Letting $n\to\infty$ and by (22), we obtain, for any $x\in F_z(\epsilon,\delta)$,

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\ln\lambda([x|_1^n])}{\ln\nu([x|_1^n])} \geqslant \frac{\alpha_\nu(1-\varepsilon)\delta}{1+\varepsilon}.$$

□

Next, we determine the other lower bound.

Proposition 19. *Let $\mu\in\mathcal{M}(X,T)$ be an invariant Borel probability measure. Assume that φ has summable variations and admits a unique Gibbs measure ν. Then we have*

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu \geqslant \beta(\nu|\mu).$$

Proof. If $h(\nu|\mu)=+\infty$, by Proposition 11 we have $\beta(\nu|\mu)\leq\alpha_\nu$. Then there is nothing to prove because of Proposition 16. It remains to consider the case of $h(\nu|\mu)<+\infty$. Recall that we just need to consider the case of $\mu\neq\nu$. By Proposition 11, what we have to prove is $\dim_\nu G_\mu \geqslant \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}$.

We are going to construct a subset $Y^*\subset G_\mu$ and a probability measure μ^* which have positive mass on Y^*. Then we will apply the Billingsley theorem.

The symbols μ_j, m_j, b_j and M_j in what follows come from Proposition 14. Let

$$Y_j := \{z|_1^{n_j}\in\mathbb{N}^{n_j} : z\in M_j\},$$

where n_j is recursively defined as follows

$$n_j \geqslant \max\{m_{j+1}b_{j+1}, N_{j-1}^2\},\ N_0=0,\ N_j=\sum_{k=1}^{j}n_k,\ \forall j\geqslant 1.$$

Define

$$Y^* := \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} Y_j.$$

By a similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 15 one can show $Y^*\subset G_\mu$. Now let us construct a measure μ^*. For $x\in X$ and $N_j<n\leqslant N_{j+1}$, define

$$\mu^*([x|_1^n]) = \prod_{k=1}^{j}\mu_k([x|_{N_{k-1}+1}^{N_k}])\times\mu_{j+1}([x|_{N_j+1}^n]).$$

This defines a probability measure on X.

Since $\mu_j(M_j) > 1 - \frac{1}{4^j}$, a simple computation shows $\mu^*(Y^*) > \frac{2}{3}$. For any $x \in Y^*$, by the definition of μ^* and the Gibbsian property of ν we have

$$\frac{\ln \mu^*([x|_1^n])}{\ln \nu([x|_1^n])} \geqslant \frac{-\sum_{k=1}^{j} \ln \mu_k([x|_{N_{k-1}+1}^{N_k}]) - \ln \mu_{j+1}([x|_{N_j+1}^{n}])}{\ln C - \sum_{k=0}^{N_j-1} \varphi(T^k x) - \sum_{k=N_j}^{n-1} \varphi(T^k x)}.$$

Here we need to deal with two cases separately. If $N_j < n < N_j + m_{j+1}$, we have

$$\frac{\ln \mu^*([x|_1^n])}{\ln \nu([x|_1^n])} \geqslant \frac{-\sum_{k=1}^{j} \ln \mu_k([x|_{N_{k-1}+1}^{N_k}])}{\ln C - \sum_{k=0}^{N_j-1} \varphi(T^k x) - \sum_{k=N_j}^{n-1} \varphi(T^k x)}.$$

For $1 \leqslant k \leqslant j$, by the definition of Y^* we have

$$T^{N_k}(x) \in M_{k+1}.$$

Hence, by Proposition 14 we have

$$-\ln \mu_k([x|_{N_{k-1}+1}^{N_k}]) \geqslant n_k(h_{\mu_k} - \frac{1}{4^k}),\ -\sum_{k=T_j}^{n-1} \varphi(T^k x) \leqslant b_{j+1},$$

and

$$-\sum_{k=0}^{N_j-1} \varphi(T^k x) \leqslant \sum_{k=1}^{j} n_k(h(\nu|\mu_k) - \frac{1}{4^k}).$$

Thus we have

$$\frac{\ln \mu^*([x|_1^n])}{\ln \nu([x|_1^n])} \geqslant \frac{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{j} n_k(h_{\mu_k} - \frac{1}{4^k})}{\frac{1}{n}\ln C + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{j} n_k(h(\nu|\mu_k) - \frac{1}{4^k}) + \frac{1}{n}b_{j+1}}.$$

By Proposition 12 and 13, we have $h_{\mu_k} \to h_\mu$ and $h(\nu|\mu_k) \to h(\nu|\mu)$ as $k \to \infty$. Noting that

$$\frac{n - N_j}{n} < \frac{m_{j+1}}{n} \leqslant \frac{1}{b_{j+1}} \to 0,\ \ \frac{b_{j+1}}{n} < \frac{b_{j+1}}{n_j} \leqslant \frac{1}{m_{j+1}} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty,$$

we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln \mu^*([x|_1^n])}{\ln \nu([x|_1^n])} \geqslant \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}.$$

If $N_j + m_{j+1} \leqslant n \leqslant N_{j+1}$, by Proposition 14 we have

$$\sum_{k=T_j}^{n-1} \varphi(T^k x) \leqslant (n - N_j)(h(\nu|\mu_{j+1}) - \frac{1}{4^{j+1}}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\ln \mu^*[x|_1^n]}{\ln \nu([x|_1^n])} &\geqslant \frac{\frac{1}{n}\sum\limits_{k=1}^{j} n_k(h_{\mu_k}-\frac{1}{4^k})+\frac{n-N_j}{n}(h_{\mu_{j+1}}-\frac{1}{4^{j+1}})}{\frac{1}{n}\ln C+\frac{1}{n}\sum\limits_{k=1}^{j} n_k(h(\nu|\mu_k)-\frac{1}{4^k})+\frac{n-N_j}{n}(h(\nu|\mu_{j+1})-\frac{1}{4^{j+1}})}\\ &\longrightarrow \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)} \text{ as } n\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

That means for any $x \in Y^*$ we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln \mu^*([x|_1^n])}{\ln \nu([x|_1^n])} \geqslant \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}.$$

By Billingsley's theorem, we have $\dim_\nu Y^* \geqslant \frac{h_\mu}{h(\nu|\mu)}$. Thus the proof is completed. □

By Propositions 16 and 19 we have the following lower bound.

Theorem 20. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ be an invariant Borel probability measure. Assume that φ has summable variations and admits a unique Gibbs measure ν with convergence exponent α_ν. Then we have*

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu \geqslant \max\{\alpha_\nu, \beta(\nu|\mu)\}.$$

5. The upper bound of the Hausdorff dimension of G_μ

In the section, we will prove the upper bound of $\dim_\nu G_\mu$. By Lemma 4, G_μ is the set of those points x such that

$$\forall\ [u] \in \mathcal{C}^*,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \Delta_{x,n}([u]) = \mu([u]).$$

Thus, for any two fixed integers $N \geqslant 1$ and $j \geqslant 1$, we have

$$G_\mu \subset \left\{x \in X : \forall u \in \Sigma_N^j,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \Delta_{x,n}([u]) = \mu([u])\right\}.$$

Note that $\Delta_{x,n}([u])$ is the frequency of appearance of u in the word $x|_1^{n+|u|-1}$. For every word $\omega \in \Sigma_N^n$ of length n and every word $u \in \Sigma_N^k$ of length k with $k \leqslant n$, denote by $p(u|\omega)$ the frequency of appearances of u in ω, i.e.,

$$p(u|\omega) = \frac{\tau_u(\omega)}{n-k+1},$$

where $\tau_u(\omega)$ denotes the number of j with $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n-k+1$, so that $\omega_j \cdots \omega_{j+k-1} = u$. We need a combinatorial lemma.

Lemma 21 ([12])**.** *For any $h > 0,\ \delta > 0,\ k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, we have*

$$\sharp\left\{\omega \in \Sigma_N^n : \sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^k} -p(u|\omega)\ln p(u|\omega) \leqslant kh\right\} \leqslant \exp(n(h+\delta)).$$

Theorem 22. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$. Assume that φ has summable variations and admits a unique Gibbs measure ν with convergence exponent α_ν. Then we have*

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu \leqslant \max\{\alpha_\nu, \beta(\nu|\mu)\}.$$

Proof. We fix two integers $N \geqslant 1$ and $j \geqslant 1$, which first N then j will tend to the infinity. According to the above analysis, we have

$$G_\mu \subset \left\{x \in X : \forall u \in \Sigma_N^j,\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \Delta_{x,n}([u]) = \mu([u])\right\}.$$

Note that $\Delta_{x,n}([u]) = n^{-1}\tau_u(x|_1^{n+j-1})$. It follows that for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$G_\mu \subset \bigcup_{l=1}^{\infty}\bigcap_{n=l}^{\infty} H_n(\epsilon, j, N),$$

where

$$H_n(\epsilon, j, N) := \left\{x \in X : \forall u \in \Sigma_N^j,\ \left|n^{-1}\tau_u(x|_1^{n+j-1}) - \mu([u])\right| < \epsilon\right\}.$$

So, by the σ-stability of the Hausdorff dimension we have

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu \leqslant \sup_{l\geqslant 1} \dim_\nu \bigcap_{n=l}^{\infty} H_n(\epsilon, j, N).$$

In order to estimate the dimension of $\bigcap_{n=l}^{\infty} H_n(\epsilon, j, N)$, let us consider the $(n+j-1)$-prefixes of the points in $H_n(\epsilon, j, N)$:

$$\Lambda_n(\epsilon, j, N) := \left\{x_1 \cdots x_{n+j-1} \in \mathbb{N}^{n+j-1} : x \in H_n(\epsilon, j, N)\right\}.$$

Let $\delta_n = \sup\{\nu([\omega]) : \omega \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$. We have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \delta_n = 0$ by Proposition 9. Then the cylinder set $\{[\omega] : \omega \in \Lambda_n(\epsilon, j, N)\}$ forms a δ_{n+j-1}-covering of $\bigcap_{n=l}^{\infty} H_n(\epsilon, j, N)$. Assume that $\gamma > \max\{\alpha_\nu, \beta(\nu|\mu)\}$ and $\gamma < 3/2$ without loss of generality. By the definition of γ- Hausdorff measure

$$\mathcal{H}^\gamma(\bigcap_{n=l}^{\infty} H_n(\epsilon, j, N)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{H}^\gamma_{\delta_{n+j-1}}(\bigcap_{n=l}^{\infty} H_n(\epsilon, j, N)) \leqslant \liminf_{n\to\infty} \sum_{\omega\in\Lambda_n(\epsilon,j,N)} \nu([\omega])^\gamma.$$

Given a word $\omega \in \Lambda_n(\epsilon, j, N)$, we consider $(\tau_u(\omega))_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}$, which would be called the appearance distribution with respect to Σ_N^j of ω. Denote by $\mathfrak{D}_n(\epsilon, j, N)$ the set of such appearance distributions of all elements of $\Lambda_n(\epsilon, j, N)$. Given a distribution $(\tau_u) \in \mathfrak{D}_n(\epsilon, j, N)$, set

$$A((\tau_u)) := \{\omega \in \Lambda_n(\epsilon, j, N) : \tau_u(\omega) = \tau_u,\ \forall u \in \Sigma_N^j\}.$$

Then $\Lambda_n(\epsilon, j, N)$ is partitioned into $A((\tau_u))$'s. Note that there are N^j possible words u in Σ_N^j and that $n(\mu([u]) - \epsilon) \leqslant \tau_u \leqslant n(\mu([u]) + \epsilon)$, i.e. τ_u varies

in an interval of length $2\epsilon n$. It follows that $\sharp\mathfrak{D}_n(\epsilon,j,N)\leqslant(2\epsilon n)^{N^j}$. This, together with the above partition, leads to

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Lambda_n(\epsilon,j,N)}\nu([\omega])^\gamma\leqslant(2\epsilon n)^{N^j}\max_{(\tau_u)\in\mathfrak{D}_n(\epsilon,j,N)}\sum_{\omega\in A((\tau_u))}\nu([\omega])^\gamma. \tag{23}$$

Our task is to estimate the sum on the right-hand side in the above inequality. We first decompose $A((\tau_u))$ into disjoint union of some sets. Given $\omega=\omega_1\cdots\omega_{n+j-1}\in A((\tau_u))$, we say $\omega_k\omega_{k+1}\cdots\omega_{k+m-1}$ is a **maximal (N,j)-run subword** of ω if the following conditions are satisfied

(1) $m\geqslant j$,
(2) $\forall 0\leqslant i\leqslant m-1,\ \omega_{k+i}\leqslant N$ and $\omega_{k-1}>N$, $\omega_{k+m}>N$.

On the other hand, a subword between **maximal (N,j)-run subword**s is called "bad subword". The set $A((\tau_u))$ is just a collection of words like

$$\omega=B_{r_1}W_{n_1}B_{r_2}\cdots W_{n_t}B_{r_{t+1}}, \tag{24}$$

where B_{r_i} denotes "bad subword" with length r_i and W_{n_i} denotes **maximal (N,j)-run subword** with length n_i. Write

$$K:=\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}\tau_u \text{ and } s:=\left\lfloor\frac{n-K}{j}\right\rfloor+1.$$

It is easily seen that $t\leqslant s$. In other word, every element in $A((\tau_u))$ has at most s **maximal (N,j)-run subword**s. Furthermore, by writing $K_t:=\sum_{i=1}^t n_i$, we have

$$K_t=K+t(j-1)$$

and

$$r_1\geqslant 0, r_{t+1}\geqslant 0, r_i\geqslant 1\ (2\leqslant i\leqslant t) \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{t+1}r_i=n+j-1-K_t. \tag{25}$$

For $1\leqslant t\leqslant s$, we denote by A_t the set of words in $A((\tau_u))$ with t **maximal (N,j)-run subword**s. It is clear that $A((\tau_u))$ is partitioned into A_t's, i.e.

$$A((\tau_u))=\bigsqcup_{t=1}^{s}A_t. \tag{26}$$

Next, we partition A_t by the length pattern of "bad subword" and **maximal (N,j)-run subword**. Recall that every word $\omega\in A_t$ has the form (24). We call $(r_1,n_1,r_2,\cdots,n_t,r_{t+1})$ the length pattern of "bad subword" and **maximal (N,j)-run subword**. Denote by $\mathfrak{L}_t$ the set of all such length pattern of ω in A_t. Given a length pattern $(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n}):=(r_1,n_1,\cdots,n_t,r_{t+1})\in\mathfrak{L}_t$, let $B(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})$ denote the set of elements of A_t with the length pattern $(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})$. Thus, A_t is partitioned into $B(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})$'s. It follows that

$$\sum_{\omega\in A_t}\nu([\omega])^\gamma\leqslant\sharp\mathfrak{L}_t\max_{(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})\in\mathfrak{L}_t}\sum_{\omega\in B(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})}\nu([\omega])^\gamma. \tag{27}$$

Let A'_t be the set of finite words by deleting all "bad subwords" of ω in A_t. Thus by the quasi Bernoulli property, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\omega\in B(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})}\nu([\omega])^\gamma &\leqslant C^{2\gamma(t+1)}\sum_{\omega\in B(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})}\prod_{i=1}^{t+1}\nu([B_{r_i}(\omega)])^\gamma\prod_{i=1}^{t}\nu([W_{n_i}(\omega)])^\gamma\\ &\leqslant C^{2\gamma(t+1)}\sum_{\omega\in B(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})}\prod_{i=1}^{t+1}\nu([B_{r_i}(\omega)])^\gamma\sum_{\omega\in B(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})}\prod_{i=1}^{t}\nu([W_{n_i}(\omega)])^\gamma\\ &\leqslant C^{\gamma(4t+5)}V\sum_{\omega\in A'_t}\nu([\omega])^\gamma,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$V:=\sum_{\omega\in B(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})}\nu([B_{r_1}(\omega)\cdots B_{r_{t+1}}(\omega)])^\gamma.$$

According to (25), we have $\sum_{i=1}^{t+1}r_i\leqslant n-K$, Thus, together with Lemma 10, this yields

$$V\leqslant\sum_{\omega\in\mathbb{N}^{n-K}}\nu([\omega])^\gamma\leqslant C_0M_0^{n-K}.$$

Then, by (27) we have

$$\sum_{\omega\in A_t}\nu([\omega])^\gamma\leqslant C_0C^{\gamma(4t+5)}M_0^{n-K}\sharp\mathfrak{L}_t\sum_{\omega\in A'_t}\nu([\omega])^\gamma. \tag{28}$$

From the definition of $H_n(\epsilon,j,N)$, we have

$$\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}(\mu([u])-\epsilon)<\frac{K}{n}<\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}(\mu([u])+\epsilon).$$

For any $\delta'>0$, one can choose N large enough and ϵ small enough i.e. $\epsilon=N^{-2j}$ such that

$$1-\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}\mu([u])<\delta'\text{ and }\epsilon N^j<\delta'.$$

It follows that

$$1-\frac{K}{n}<\epsilon N^j+\delta'<2\delta'. \tag{29}$$

According to the definition of s and the fact that $t\leqslant s$, for any $\delta>0$, when δ' is taken small enough we have

$$C_0C^{\gamma(4t+5)}M_0^{n-K}\leqslant e^{n\delta/2}. \tag{30}$$

On the other hand, we observe that very length pattern $(\mathbf{r},\mathbf{n})\in\mathfrak{L}_t$ is just corresponding to the integer solution of the following equation set

$$\begin{cases}\sum_{i=1}^t n_i=K_t,\ n_i\geqslant j(1\leqslant i\leqslant t),\\ \sum_{i=1}^{t+1}r_i=n+j-1-K_t,\ r_1\geqslant 0,\ r_{t+1}\geqslant 0,\ r_i\geqslant 1\ (2\leqslant i\leqslant t).\end{cases}$$

By the element combinatorial theory, one can obtain the following estimate

$$\sharp\mathfrak{L}_t \leqslant \frac{(K-1)!}{(K-t)!(t-1)!}\frac{(n-K-(t-1)j+t)!}{t!(n-K-(t-1)j)!}.$$

Noting that j is a fixed integer relative to n, by the Stirling formula we have

$$\frac{(K-1)!}{(K-t)!(t-1)!}\frac{(n-K-(t-1)j+t)!}{t!(n-K-(t-1)j)!} \leqslant e^{n\delta/2}.$$

In combination with (28) and (30), this yields

$$\sum_{\omega\in A_t}\nu([\omega])^\gamma \leqslant e^{n\delta}\sum_{\omega\in A'_t}\nu([\omega])^\gamma. \tag{31}$$

Now we estimate the sum on the right-hand side in the above inequality. First we consider a set

$$\widetilde{A}_t = \{\widetilde{B}_{r_1}W_{n_1}\widetilde{B}_{r_2}\cdots W_{n_t}\widetilde{B}_{r_{t+1}} : \omega = B_{r_1}W_{n_1}B_{r_2}\cdots W_{n_t}B_{r_{t+1}} \in A_t\},$$

where $\widetilde{B}_{r_i}$ is a finite word composed of digit $N+1$ with length r_i. In other word, the set $\widetilde{A}_t$ is just a set of finite words obtained by replacing each "bad subword" B_{r_i} of ω in A_t by a finite word composed of digit $N+1$ with length r_i. Thus the two sets $\widetilde{A}_t$ and A'_t have the same cardinal and each subword $u \in \Sigma_N^j$ appears τ_u times in ω of $\widetilde{A}_t$. Take

$$h = \frac{1}{j}\Big(\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j} -\frac{\tau_u}{n}\ln\frac{\tau_u}{n} - \frac{n-K}{n}\ln\frac{n-K}{n}\Big)$$

in Lemma 21. Then, for the same $\delta > 0$ as above and for n large enough we have

$$\sharp A'_t = \sharp\widetilde{A}_t \leqslant \quad \exp(n(h+\delta)). \tag{32}$$

Given $\omega \in A'_t$, denote by (τ'_u) the appearance distribution with respect to Σ_N^j of ω. Then, we have

$$|\omega| = K_t \text{ and } \tau_u \leqslant \tau'_u \leqslant \tau_u + (t-1)(j-1) \leqslant \tau_u + n - K. \tag{33}$$

By the Gibbsian property and (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
j\ln\nu([\omega_1\cdots\omega_{K_t}]) &\leqslant j\ln C + j\sum_{i=0}^{K_t-1}\varphi(T^ix)\\
&= j\ln C + \sum_{i=0}^{j-2}(j-1-i)\varphi(T^ix)\\
&\quad + \sum_{i=K_t-j+1}^{K_t-1}(K_t-i)\varphi(T^ix) + \sum_{i=0}^{K_t-j}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\varphi(T^{i+k}x)\\
&\leqslant (K_t + j^2 - j + 1)\ln C + \sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}\tau'_u\ln\nu([u]),
\end{aligned}$$

where we obtain the equality by taking the sums along the oblique diagonals as shown in the following figure and the last inequality follows from the Gibbsian property and (6).



Together with (32), this yields

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\omega\in A'_t}\nu^\gamma([\omega]) &\leq \sharp A'_t \max_{\omega\in A'_t}\nu^\gamma([\omega])\\ &\leq \exp\left\{n(h+\delta)+\frac{\gamma}{j}\Big\{\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}\tau'_u\ln\nu([u])+(K_t+j^2)\ln C\Big\}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

Rewrite the right-hand side of the above inequality as

$$\exp\{nL(\gamma,j,(\tau'_u))\},$$

where

$$L(\gamma,j,(\tau'_u))=h+\frac{\gamma}{j}\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}\frac{\tau'_u}{n}\ln\nu([u])+\frac{\gamma}{jn}(K_t+j^2)\ln C+\delta.$$

Now we shall give a negative upper-bound of $L(\gamma,j,(\tau'_u))$. In virtue of the definition of $H_n(\epsilon,j,N)$ and (33), we can take $\epsilon>0$ small enough and n large enough such that

$$\frac{1}{j}\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}\frac{\tau'_u}{n}\ln\nu([u])\leq-\frac{1}{j}H_{j,N}(\nu,\mu)+\delta. \tag{34}$$

At the same time, we can take j large enough such that

$$\frac{1}{jn}(K_t+j^2)\ln C\leqslant\delta/2\ .$$

In combination with the last two inequalities, we have

$$L(\gamma,j,(\tau'_u)) \leq h-\gamma\frac{1}{j}H_{j,N}(\nu,\mu)+(3/2+\gamma)\delta.$$

Recall that

$$3/2>\gamma>\beta(\nu|\mu),$$

We take $\delta>0$ small enough and j, N large enough such that

$$\gamma\geqslant\frac{\frac{1}{j}H_{j,N}(\mu,\mu)+7\delta}{\frac{1}{j}H_{j,N}(\nu,\mu)}. \tag{35}$$

By a similar argument of (34), we have

$$-\frac{1}{j}\sum_{u\in\Sigma_N^j}\frac{\tau_u}{n}\ln\frac{\tau_u}{n}\leq\frac{1}{j}H_{j,N}(\mu,\mu)+\delta.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}L(\gamma,j,(\tau'_u)) &\leq h-\frac{1}{j}H_{j,N}(\mu,\mu)-4\delta\\ &\leq -\frac{1}{j}\frac{n-K}{n}\ln\frac{n-K}{n}-3\delta,\end{aligned}$$

By (29), we can take δ' small enough such that

$$-\frac{n-K}{n}\ln\frac{n-K}{n}\leq\delta.$$

Thus, we have

$$L(\gamma,j,(\tau'_u))\leq -2\delta,$$

and

$$\sum_{\omega\in A'_t}\nu^\gamma([\omega])\leq\exp(-2n\delta).$$

In combination with (23), (26) and (31), this yields

$$\sum_{\omega\in\Lambda_n(\epsilon,j,N)}\nu([\omega])^\gamma\leqslant s(2\epsilon n)^{N^j}e^{-n\delta},$$

which implies that for any $\gamma>\max\{\alpha_\nu,\beta(\nu|\mu)\}$,

$$\mathcal{H}^\gamma(\bigcap_{n=l}^{\infty}H_n(\epsilon,j,N))=\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{H}^\gamma_{\delta_{n+j-1}}(\bigcap_{n=l}^{\infty}H_n(\epsilon,j,N))=0.$$

Then it follows that

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu\leqslant\gamma.$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\dim_\nu G_\mu\leqslant\max\{\alpha_\nu,\beta(\nu|\mu)\}.$$

□

6. Applications

In the section, we study the set of generic points of an invariant measure for an expanding interval map by transferring dimension results from the symbolic space to the interval $[0,1)$. However, for convenience of presentation, we choose to work with the continued fraction system. Then we will give the proof of Theorem 2. Furthermore, we will describe the Hausdorff dimension of the sets of generic points of an invariant measure for the Gauss transformation with respect to the Euclidean metric on $[0,1)$. The corresponding results will be stated without proof for a class of expanding interval maps.

6.1. **Gauss transformation.** Define the Gauss transformation $S:[0,1)\to[0,1)$ by

$$S(0):=0,\quad S(x):=\frac{1}{x}-\left\lfloor\frac{1}{x}\right\rfloor,\quad x\in(0,1).$$

Then every irrational number in $[0,1)$ can be written uniquely as an infinite expansion of the form

$$x=\cfrac{1}{a_1(x)+\cfrac{1}{a_2(x)+\ddots}},$$

where $a_1(x)=\lfloor\frac{1}{x}\rfloor$ and $a_k(x)=a_1(S^{k-1}(x))$ for $k\geqslant 2$ are called the partial quotients of x. For simplicity we denote the expansion by $(a_1a_2\cdots)$. Let $\mathcal{M}([0,1),S)$ denote all invariant Borel probability measures with respect to S on $[0,1)$. Set

$$\Delta(a_1a_2\cdots a_n):=\{x\in[0,1):x_1=a_1,x_2=a_2,\cdots,x_n=a_n\}$$

which is called a rank-n basic interval. Define $\kappa:\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}\to(0,1)$ by

$$\kappa(a_1a_2\cdots)=\cfrac{1}{a_1+\cfrac{1}{a_2+\ddots}}.$$

Hence

$$\kappa([a_1\cdots a_n])=\Delta(a_1\cdots a_n).$$

This establishes a one-to-one correspondence between the cylinders in X and the basic intervals in $[0,1)$.

Proof of Theorem 2. Recall that η_s is the Gibbs measure associated to the potential $\phi_s(x)=2s\ln x$ for $s>\frac{1}{2}$. Define the potential function

$$\varphi_s(\omega)=\phi_s\circ\kappa(\omega)$$

on X. Then φ_s admits a unique Gibbs measure ν_s which has the same convergence exponent with η_s and satisfies for all cylinder $[\omega]\in\mathcal{C}^*$

$$\nu_s([\omega])=\eta_s(\Delta(\omega)). \tag{36}$$

That implies that

$$\dim_{\nu_s}A=\dim_{\eta_s}\kappa(A) \tag{37}$$

for any subset A of X.

Now define

$$\theta:=\ell\circ\kappa$$

on $\mathcal{B}(X)$. Then the two systems $(X,\mathcal{B}(X),\theta,T)$ and $([0,1),\mathcal{B}([0,1)),\sigma,S)$ are isomorphic. Hence $h_\theta=h_\ell$. Let G_θ be the set of generic points of θ on the system (X,T). By a standard argument, one can cheeck

$$\mathcal{G}_\ell=\kappa(G_\theta).$$

According to the analysis following Theorem 1 and (37) we have completed the proof of Theorem 2. □

Denote by $\dim_H \mathcal{G}_\ell$ the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{G}_\ell$ with respect to the Euclidean metric on $[0,1)$. Our next result shows that $\dim_H \mathcal{G}_\ell$ equals the Billingsley dimension $\dim_\lambda \mathcal{G}_\ell$, where λ is the Lebesgue measure. First, we note a fact that for any subset $A \subset (0,1)$, we have $\dim_H A \leqslant \dim_\lambda A$, because the former dimension index is defined by using the covering of arbitrary intervals and the later one by the covering of basic intervals. By a result of Wegmann ([30], see also [4], p. 360), the equality holds in the following situation.

Proposition 23. *One has* $\dim_H A = \dim_\lambda A$ *for* $A \subset (0,1)$ *if*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln \lambda(\Delta(x_1 \cdots x_n))}{\ln \lambda(\Delta(x_1 \cdots x_{n+1}))} = 1, \ (\forall x \in A). \tag{38}$$

Theorem 24. *For any* $\ell \in \mathcal{M}([0,1), S)$*, we have*

$$\dim_H \mathcal{G}_\ell = \max\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{h_\ell}{-2\int_0^1 \ln x \,\mathrm{d}\ell(x)}\right\}.$$

Proof. Note that η_1 is the Gauss measure with density $\frac{1}{\ln 2}\frac{1}{(1+x)}$. It follows that $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{2}$. Hence, ν_1 also has convergence exponent $\frac{1}{2}$. By Theorem 1 and (37), we have

$$\dim_H \mathcal{G}_\ell \leqslant \dim_\lambda \mathcal{G}_\ell = \dim_{\eta_1} \mathcal{G}_\ell = \dim_{\nu_1} G_\theta = \max\left\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{h_\theta}{-\int \varphi_1 \,\mathrm{d}\theta}\right\},$$

where the first equality comes from the fact that the Gauss measure η_1 is boundedly equivalent to the Lebesgue measure λ.

It remains to show the converse inequality. Recall that we have constructed two subsets for the lower bound estimation of $\dim_\nu G_\mu$ in Section 4 and we will use them once more. First, by Proposition 15, there exists $z = (z_n)_{n\geqslant 1} \in G_\theta$ such that

$$-\sum_{k=1}^{(q+1)^2} \ln \nu_1([z_k]) \ll \sum_{k=1}^{q} k^2. \tag{39}$$

For a positive number $a > 1$, set

$$F = \left\{x \in X : x_{k^2} \in (a^{k^2}, 2a^{k^2}];\ x_k = z_k \text{ if } k \text{ is nonsquare}\right\}.$$

It is clear that $F \subset G_\theta$. Thus, we have $\dim_{\nu_1} F \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$ by a similar argument in the proof of Proposition 18. Let $x \in \kappa(F) \subset \mathcal{G}_\ell$. By the quasi Bernoulli property, we have

$$C^{-(n+1)} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \eta_1(\Delta(x_i)) \leqslant \eta_1(\Delta(x_1 \cdots x_n)) \leqslant C^{n+1} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \eta_1(\Delta(x_i)).$$

In combination with (36) and (39), using once more the fact that η_1 has density function $\frac{1}{\ln 2}\frac{1}{(1+x)}$, one can show

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\ln \eta_1(\Delta(x_1\cdots x_n))}{n^{3/2}} = -\frac{2}{3}\ln a.$$

As we have mentioned a fact that the Gauss measure η_1 is boundedly equivalent to the Lebesgue measure λ, it follows that (38) holds. So by Proposition 23 and (37), we have

$$\dim_H \mathcal{G}_\ell \geqslant \dim_H \kappa(F) = \dim_\lambda \kappa(F) = \dim_{\eta_1} \kappa(F) = \dim_{\nu_1} F \geqslant \frac{1}{2}.$$

Second, in the case of $|\int \varphi_1 \,\mathrm{d}\theta| < +\infty$, consider the set Y^* in the proof of Proposition 19. Let $x \in \kappa(Y^*) \subset \mathcal{G}_\ell$, we can show just like in the proof of Proposition 19

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\ln \lambda(\Delta(x_1\cdots x_n))}{n} = \int_0^1 2\ln x \,\mathrm{d}\ell(x),$$

which implies (38), so by Proposition 23 and (37), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_H \mathcal{G}_\ell &\geqslant \dim_H \kappa(Y^*) = \dim_\lambda \kappa(Y^*) = \dim_{\eta_1} \kappa(Y^*)\\ &= \dim_{\nu_1} Y^* \geqslant \frac{h_\theta}{-\int \varphi_1 \,\mathrm{d}\theta} = \frac{h_\ell}{-2\int_0^1 \ln x \,\mathrm{d}\ell(x)}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the two lower bounds, we have completed the proof. □

6.2. **Expanding interval dynamics.** Let $([0,1], f)$ be an expanding interval dynamical system. More precisely, we assume that $f : [0,1] \to [0,1]$ is a map for which there exists a countable collection of pairwise disjoint open intervals $\{I_a\}_{a\in S}$ such that

(1) $[0,1] = \bigcup_{a\in S} \overline{I}_a$;
(2) $f|_{I_a}$ is a C^2 diffeomorphism of I_a onto $(0,1)$ for each $a \in S$;
(3) Uniform expansion: There exist constants $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi > 1$ such that
$$|(f^N)'(x)| \geqslant \xi \text{ for any } x \in \bigcup_{a\in S} I_a;$$
(4) Rényi's condition: there exists a constant K such that
$$\sup_{a\in S}\sup_{x,y,z\in I_a}\frac{|f''(x)|}{|f'(y)f'(z)|} \leqslant K.$$

Such dynamic is called Expanding Markov Rényi dynamical system ([21]). Suppose $\ln|f'|$ has summable variations and finite 1-order variation and Gurevich pressure. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, consider potential function $\psi_s(x) = -s\ln|f'(x)|$. Set $s_0 = \inf\{s \geqslant 0 : P_{\psi_s} < +\infty\}$. Then for any $s > s_0$ the potential function ψ_s admits a unique Gibbs measure η_s and the corresponding convergence exponent will be denoted by α_{η_s}. Now let us state a result for the above expanding interval dynamical systems and omit the proof, because one can

transfer the dimension result from the symbolic space to the interval $[0,1]$ as we do with the continued fraction system.

Theorem 25. *Let ℓ be an f-invariant Borel probability measure on $[0,1]$. For any $s > s_0$, if $\int_0^1 \ln|f'(x)|\,\mathrm{d}\ell(x) < +\infty$ we have*

$$\dim_{\eta_s} \mathcal{G}_\ell = \max\left\{\alpha_{\eta_s}, \frac{h_\ell}{P_{\psi_s} + s\int_0^1 \ln|f'(x)|\,\mathrm{d}\ell(x)}\right\};$$

otherwise we have

$$\dim_{\eta_s} \mathcal{G}_\ell = \alpha_{\eta_s}.$$

Rényi's condition implies that the Gibbs measure associated to $\psi_1(x)$ is boundedly equivalent to the Lebesgue measure ([1], see also[26], p. 105). As a counterpart of Theorem 24 for such general expanding maps, we have the following result.

Theorem 26. *For any $\ell \in \mathcal{M}([0,1), f)$, we have*

$$\dim_H \mathcal{G}_\ell = \max\left\{\alpha_{\eta_1}, \frac{h_\ell}{\int_0^1 \ln|f'(x)|\,\mathrm{d}\ell(x)}\right\}.$$

Acknowledgment: The authors are supported by Program Caiyuanpei. The second author would like to thank the hospitality of LAMFA Picarde University where this work is partly done. The second author is supported by NSFC(11501112, 11471075) and the third author is supported by NSFC (11171128, 11271148).

References

[1] R. Adler, F-expansions revisited. Recent advances in topological dynamics (Proc. Conf., Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn., 1972; in honor of Gustav Arnold Nedlund), pp. 1-5. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. **318**, Springer, Berlin, 1973.

[2] P. Billingsley, Convergence of probability measures (2th edition). John Wiley & Sons Inc, 1999.

[3] R. Bowen, Topological entropy for noncompact set. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **184** (1973), 125-136.

[4] H. Cajar, Billingsley Dimension in probability spaces. Springer-Verlag, 1981.

[5] M. Denker, C. Grillenberger, K. Sigmund, Ergodic theory on compact spaces. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. **527**. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976.

[6] A. H. Fan, D. J. Feng, On the distribution of long-term time averages on symbolic space. J. Statist. Phys. **99** (2000), no. 3-4, 813-856.

[7] A. H. Fan, D. J. Feng and J. Wu, Recurence, dimension and entropy. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **64** (2001), 229-244.

[8] A. H. Fan, L. M. Liao and J. H. Ma, On the frequency of partial quotients of regular continued fractions. Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **148** (2010), 179-192.

[9] A. H. Fan, L. M. Liao, J. H. Ma and B. W. Wang, Dimension of Besicovitch-Eggleston sets in countable symbolic space. Nonlinearity **23** (2010) 1185-1197.

[10] A. H. Fan, L. M. Liao and J. Peyrière, Generic points in systems of specification and Banach valued Birkhoff ergodic average. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **21** (2008), no. 4, 1103-1128.

[11] A. H. Fan, T. Jordan, L.M. Liao and M. Rams, Multifractal analysis for expanding interval maps with infinitely many branches. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 3, 1847C1870.
[12] E. Glasner and B. Weiss, On the interplay between measurable and topological dynamics, Handbook of dynamical systems. Vol.1B (Elsevier B.V., Amsterdam, 2006), 597-648.
[13] B. M. Gurevich, A. A. Tempelman, Hausdorff dimension of sets of generic points for Gibbs measures. Dedicated to David Ruelle and Yasha Sinai on the occasion of their 65th birthdays. J. Statist. Phys. **108** (2002), no. 5-6, 1281-1301.
[14] L. M. Liao, J.H. Ma and B.W. Wang, Dimension of some non-normal continued fraction sets. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **145** (2008), no. 1, 215-225.
[15] J. H. Ma, Z. Y. Wen, Hausdorff and packing measure of sets of generic points: a zero-infinity law. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **69** (2004), 383-406
[16] P. Mattila, Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces. Fractals and rectifiability. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **44**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
[17] E. Olivier, Dimension de Billingsley d'ensembles saturés. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **328** (1999), no. 1, 13-16.
[18] K. R. Parthasarathy, Probability measure on metric space. Academic Press, New York and London, 1967.
[19] C.-E. Pfister, W. G. Sullivan, Billingsley dimension on shift spaces. Nonlinearity **16** (2003), no. 2, 661-682.
[20] C.-E. Pfister, W. G. Sullivan, On the topological entropy of saturated sets. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **27** (2007), no. 3, 929-956.
[21] M. Pollicott, H. Weiss, Multifractal analysis of Lyapunov exponent for continued fraction and Manneville-Pomeau transformations and applications to Diophantine approximation. Comm. Math. Phys. **207** (1999), no. 1, 145-171.
[22] G. Pólya, G. Szegö, Problems and theorems in analysis. Vol. I: Series, integral calculus, theory of functions. Springer, 1972.
[23] O. Sarig, Thermodynamic formalism for countable Markov shifts. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **19** (1999), no. 6, 1565-1593.
[24] O. Sarig, Existence of Gibbs measures for countable Markov shifts. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **131** (2003), no. 6, 1751-1558.
[25] O. Sarig, Lecture notes on thermodynamic formalism for topological markov shifts. 2009. See also http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/∼sarigo/TDFnotes.pdf.
[26] F. Schweiger, Ergodic theory of fibred systems and metric number theory. Oxford Science Publications. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995.
[27] E. Seneta, Non-negative matrices and Markov chains. Springer, 2006.
[28] P. Walters, Invariant measures and equilibrium states for some mappings which expand distances. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **236** (1978), 121-153.
[29] P. Walters, An introduction to ergodic theory. Springer-Verlag, 1982.
[30] H. Wegmann, Über den dimensionsbegriff in wahrscheinlichkeitsrumen, II Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verwandte Geb. **9** (1968), 222-231.

Aihua Fan: LAMFA CNRS UMR 7352, Université de Picardie Jules Verne, 33, Rue Saint Leu, 80039 Amiens Cedex 1, France
E-mail address: ai-hua.fan@u-picardie.fr

Mingtian Li: School of Mathematics and Computer Science, Fujian Normal University, 350007 Fuzhou, People' Republic of China
E-mail address: limtwd@fjnu.edu.cn

Jihua Ma: Department of Mathematics Wuhan University, 430072 Wuhan, People' Republic of China
E-mail address: jhma@whu.edu.cn